

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 13, 15 and 17-21 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1 and 2 being independent.

As will be appreciated, the claims as presented in the Amendment After Final Rejection of March 11, 2009, have been further amended to better emphasize that the reflected light emitted from the reflection surface has the angular distribution characteristics. These changes are submitted to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art.

Currently, Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over Ikeda '521 in view of Akins '787. In addition, Claims 5 and 19 are rejected as allegedly being obvious over those citations and further in view of Iwai (JP '392).

For at least the reasons set forth in the Amendment After Final Rejection, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Additionally, in the Advisory Action mailed April 10, 2009, the attached continuation sheet noted that Ikeda discloses the use of light absorbing particles in the system thus reducing the amount of reflected light from where the particles are collected resulting in a smaller angular distribution than where the light is reflected from the reflection surface. In this regard, it is acknowledged that Ikeda uses light absorbing particles in its electrophoretic display device; Akins, however, does not. In Akins, a reflection type optical display device uses a prismatic film 12, an optical cell 14, and a reflector 16.

The Office Action of December 24, 2008, acknowledged that Ikeda does not provide light intensity with an angular distribution as provided in Applicants' claimed invention. It is respectfully submitted that Akins cannot be relied on to compensate for this deficiency, since it is

directed to a different type of display device in which prismatic film is used in an attempt to reduce glare.

The tertiary citation to Iwai relates to a liquid crystal display and is relied on for its teaching of dividing a reflection surface into a plurality of areas. Iwai fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Ikeda and Akins.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 1 and 2 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 3-9, 13, 15 and 17-21 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Due consideration and prompt passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
SDMvnn

FCHS_WS 3214738v1